

## SITE PLAN COMMITTEE

APRIL 10, 2001

### 1. ROLL CALL

The meeting was called to order at 4:04 p.m. Committee members present were Chair Jeff Evans, James Aucamp, Jr., Sam Engel, and Vice-Mayor Judy Paul (departed at 5:25 p.m.). Also in attendance were Planner Scott McClure and Board Secretary Janet Gale recording the meeting. Vice-Chair Marcellino was absent.

### 2. APPROVAL OF MINUTES: January 23, 2001 March 27, 2001

Vice-Mayor Paul made a motion, seconded by Mr. Aucamp, to approve the minutes for January 23, 2001, and March 27, 2001. In a roll call vote, the vote was as follows: Chair Evans - yes; Vice-Chair Marcellino - absent; Mr. Aucamp - yes; Mr. Engel - yes; Vice Mayor Paul - yes. **(Motion carried 4-0)**

### 3. SIGN

#### 3.1 SP 3-1-01, McDonald's at Martin Square, 4492 Weston Road (BP)

Dawn McDonald and Rosangela DeMello, representing the petitioner, were present. Mr. McClure read the planning report (Planning and Zoning Division's recommendation: approval).

Ms. McDonald stated the overall project received site plan approval in September 2000, and was unsure as to why the monument sign and accent lighting were not included in that application. Her purpose for appearing at this meeting was to request approval for these two items.

Vice-Mayor Paul questioned why they were using neon and asked if that was part of the standard design of the building. Ms. McDonald stated that it was an added architectural feature that helped to compliment the building. Mr. Engel described it as a skeleton line and Ms. McDonald added that it was only going to be on the south side of the building, which was the front of the building. Chair Evans asked if the neon light was going to be one strip. Ms. DeMello responded that it was only the one strip.

Vice-Mayor Paul asked if it was higher than the building itself. Mr. Engel stated that according to the elevation, it was a little higher than the building. Mr. McClure clarified that by Code, the neon strip could not be installed higher than the lowest roofline. Ms. McDonald explained that this lighting structure was called low-voltage accent lighting and it was energy efficient. Discussion continued on the placement of the neon lighting and Ms. DeMello stated that it could be moved; however, she felt that it would look nicer as an accent on the top of the building. Vice-Mayor Paul stated that the surrounding area, which was more natural, might not be conducive to this type of sign. She was also concerned that other businesses might follow suit and there would be too many lights and signs along the canal area.

Mr. Engel clarified that the light should be placed on the fascia of the lowest roof line. Mr. McClure stated that the length could not be longer than the length of the building. Ms. DeMello added that aesthetically it would be more appealing if the neon went from one side to the other and Mr. McClure stated that would be acceptable.

Chair Evans questioned if the other signs shown were previously approved and Ms. DeMello stated they had been. She wanted it to be noted for correction that the color of the bottom of the monument sign would match the building which was a light beige color.

**SITE PLAN COMMITTEE**  
**APRIL 10, 2001**

Chair Evans stated that he thought all new McDonald's restaurants were going to be painted white and red. It was stated that this McDonald's was going to match the shopping center. Chair Evans asked about the roof. Vice-Mayor Paul stated that this McDonald's was using barrel tile roofing. Ms. DeMello stated that the Spanish style and colors matched the shopping center. Vice-Mayor Paul stated that prior discussion regarding McDonald's restaurant color schemes referred to a McDonald's restaurant in a shopping center that had no prominent color scheme.

Vice-Mayor Paul asked Mr. McClure if the monument sign met Code requirements and Mr. McClure stated that as far as size was concerned, it did. Vice-Mayor Paul was again concerned that a group of monument signs would be erected along the canal because other businesses might ask for similar exposure. Chair Evans stated there was a 7-11 on one corner and a Honda dealership was going to be built on another corner. Vice-Mayor Paul asked if 7-11 had a sign on the corner and Chair Evans stated he thought there was one on the corner.

Vice-Mayor Paul asked where the horse trail was and if it went along that area. Chair Evans stated that the horse trail had been moved around. Vice-Mayor Paul was concerned that if signs were installed, they might infringe on the horse trail.

Vice-Mayor Paul asked if there was approval from Central Broward Drainage District for the monument sign on the canal easement. Ms. McDonald stated this item went before that agency and had been unanimously approved. Vice-Mayor Paul was surprised as Central Broward Drainage denied tree planting there, but was allowing signage. Mr. McClure asked if it was the C-11 canal. Ms. DeMello explained that it was lake maintenance easement.

Chair Evans stated that the positive aspect was that there was a horse trail there. Mr. Engel stated that he was not sure where the horse trail was as it had been moved often. Mr. McClure stated that there was a 15 foot recreational easement which should have been located there. Chair Evans stated that it was pavement and lake easement. Vice-Mayor Paul was concerned that the size of the sign would inhibit horse passage and wanted to be sure that this sign would not result in having to move the trail again.

The Committee closely reviewed the plans and Mr. Engel stated that perhaps this item could be approved, subject to confirmation of the horse trail. Vice-Mayor Paul stated that she would prefer to table this item as it would not affect the actual construction of the building. She added that there were gray areas and preferred to have more detail before making a decision. Vice-Mayor Paul felt that approval of the neon sign could be given at this meeting; however, she expressed that it was better to wait for clarification on items, rather than giving approval pending "other things," because there was always the chance that these variables could be overlooked at future meetings.

Vice-Mayor Paul stated that she wanted staff to check the area to confirm distances and location of the horse trail. Chair Evans stated that he was opposed to erecting signs on horse trails, particularly on this site because the horse trail had been moved so many times, adding that he did not blame the applicants.

Mr. Aucamp asked if there was an alternative location for the sign. Ms. DeMello stated that there were easements on the south and east side of the property. Chair Evans stated that the sign was not a requirement, but rather a desire. Vice-Mayor Paul clarified that this restaurant was in the back of the development and agreed that exposure was important. Ms.

DeMello added that there was no direct access from Griffin Road and that was why exposure was important. Mr. Aucamp asked what the plan of action would be if this item was tabled.

## **SITE PLAN COMMITTEE**

### **APRIL 10, 2001**

Vice-Mayor Paul offered to investigate the site and stated that she also wanted to look at the overall plans and how the horse trails would be impacted. She reiterated that she was in favor of the neon sign.

Ms. DeMello asked if it was possible to approve if, after investigation, if it was ascertained that the horse trail was not there. She stated that if the horse trail was there, she would work with staff and then return to this Committee with recommendations from staff. Vice-Mayor Paul suggested that perhaps there were alternative locations for the sign.

Vice-Mayor Paul made a motion, seconded by Mr. Engel, to approve the skeleton neon along the length of the building underneath the fascia, or not at the top point that had been indicated on the plans, and that the monument sign be deferred to the next meeting [April 24, 2001] in order to check on the horse trail issue. In a roll call vote, the vote was as follows: Chair Evans - yes; Vice-Chair Marcellino - absent; Mr. Aucamp - yes; Mr. Engel - yes; Vice Mayor Paul - yes. **(Motion carried 4-0)**

## **4. SITE PLANS**

### **4.1 SP 3-1-01, Tail End Pet Resort, 10401 Orange Drive (A-1) (tabled from February 27, 2001)**

Gus Aguirre, representing the petitioner, was present. Mr. McClure read the planning report (Planning and Zoning Division's recommendation: approval subject to the conditions as outlined in the planning report).

Vice-Mayor Paul asked where the two trees stated in the conditions of the planning report were going to be located. Mr. McClure explained they were going along the west perimeter because Maleleuca were being removed from that area, and the condition was to add two trees to replace those that were being removed. He added that these two trees were in addition to what was already proposed in the landscaping plan.

Vice-Mayor Paul asked where the perimeter berm was. Mr. McClure explained that was an engineering conflict and he believed it was already resolved between the petitioner and the Engineering Department.

Mr. Aguirre explained that the plan was fully approved approximately a year ago. He further explained that there was a year long conflict between Broward County and the Town regarding this facility because of zoning. Mr. Aguirre added that the Broward County Commission had overruled staff and approved the project. He stated that all the approvals were in place for this project and all conflicts were resolved. Vice-Mayor Paul asked if there was site plan approval and Mr. Aguirre responded that it had been approved. Mr. McClure added that the site plan had expired.

Vice-Mayor Paul was concerned that there was an outdoor exercise area and there were residents on both east and west sides of the property. Her concern was that whether residents were protected from noise. Mr. Aguirre stated there was a public hearing at the inception of this plan and none of the neighbors objected to this project.

Vice-Mayor Paul again asked about the berm, wanting to know its location and height. Chair Evans stated that he only saw a swale and not a berm and Vice-Mayor Paul agreed. Mr. Aguirre stated that the perimeter berms were two feet inside the property line. Mr. Evans

stated that was where the swale was, but upon closer examination of the plan found that the berm was next to the swale and it was less than five inches high. Vice-Mayor Paul stated that she was interested in the height of the berm and wanted to know if there was landscaping there

## **SITE PLAN COMMITTEE**

### **APRIL 10, 2001**

which would act as a buffer. There was concern that there was no drainage because the berm was so low. Mr. Aguirre pointed out the direction in which the water would move and felt there would be no drainage problem around the perimeter. Chair Evans asked if this was a requirement or if this was being done to keep the water within the property. Mr. Aguirre stated that this was to keep the water within the property. Mr. Engel stated that Central Broward Water Control District required a berm and felt that the berm was added because it was required. Mr. Aguirre stated that calculations were approved both by Central Broward Water Control District and South Florida Water Management. Vice-Mayor Paul was not satisfied with the height of the berms, questioning whether the retention areas would hold the water.

Mr. Aguirre explained the elevations of the property, adding that in site plans, full engineering drawings were not usually provided. Vice-Mayor Paul stated she was concerned with drainage issues in this area prior to becoming a member of the Committee. Mr. Aucamp questioned whether the Committee dealt with drainage issues and Vice-Mayor Paul stated that to a certain degree they did. She added that she wanted to make sure when approving this plan that it would accommodate the drainage. Mr. Aucamp stated that it was the role of the Engineering Department and Vice-Mayor Paul suggested that the plans should go through the Engineering Department prior to site plan. Mr. McClure stated that comment #3 in the staff report addressed this issue. Vice-Mayor Paul again questioned if the berms were deep enough to accommodate the drainage.

Mr. Aguirre stated that this project would not have moved ahead had it not been previously approved by Central Broward Water Control District and South Florida Water Management. Vice-Mayor Paul felt that it was more than an aesthetic concern and that this did not answer her question as all it stated was that it was going to be revised.

Mr. Engel asked who the architect was. Mr. Aguirre was not sure. Mr. Engel stated that State law required that the architect's name had to be imprinted on the plan. Chair Evans added that the architect's license number also needed to be included. Mr. Engel and Chair Evans stated that neither of these were on the plan and Vice-Mayor Paul pointed out that there was no seal either. Mr. Engel stated that the issuance of these plans was in violation of the law. He added that the architect had to be a member of the firm. Mr. Aguirre stated that they would provide the Committee with this information.

Chair Evans stated that this was the second time this application had come before the Committee and the Committee would not address this application in the future unless the plans were in order, with all required signatures, registration numbers, and seals.

Mr. Aucamp questioned why this plan was before this Committee without having met these standard requirements. Chair Evans stated that it should not have been forwarded to the Committee. Mr. Aucamp stated that it was staff's responsibility to insure that plans were in order. He added that engineering and drainage issues were not the responsibilities of the Committee.

There was further discussion regarding this incomplete application and whose responsibility it was to insure the application was in order when it reached this Committee level.

Vice-Mayor Paul made a motion, seconded by Mr. Engel, to table to the next meeting. In a roll call vote, the vote was as follows: Chair Evans - yes; Vice-Chair Marcellino - absent; Mr. Aucamp - yes; Mr. Engel - yes; Vice Mayor Paul - yes. (**Motion carried 4-0**)

## **SITE PLAN COMMITTEE**

### **APRIL 10, 2001**

Chair Evans instructed Mr. Aguirre what was necessary to make the application complete, including the Engineering Department's approval, the signatures, and seals. Mr. McClure stated that the plans were to be submitted to the Engineering Department again. He added that there might be other changes as a new engineer was hired since the prior review of these plans. Councilmember Paul added that she wanted confirmation regarding the berm.

Vice-Mayor Paul amended the motion, seconded by Mr. Engel, to table until May 8, 2001. In a voice vote, with Vice-Chair Marcellino absent, all voted in favor. (**Motion carried 4-0**)

#### **4.2 SP 2-1-01, Summit/Questa Montessori School, 5451 South West 64 Avenue (CF)**

Donald Wilken and Judy Dempsey, representing the petitioner, were present. Mr. McClure read the planning report (Planning and Zoning Division's recommendation: approval).

Vice-Mayor Paul stated that this application was on a previous agenda. There was discussion amongst Committee members regarding applicant notification. Mr. McClure stated that it was the responsibility of applicants to find out when they were scheduled. Chair Evans felt that the applicants should be notified if they were added to an agenda. Mr. McClure stated that once the applicant received comments from Development Review Committee, if the application was complete, it would be included in the next agenda.

Mr. Aucamp stated that this item should be addressed under Old Business.

Vice-Mayor Paul asked if this building was included in the original plan when it was presented to the Town Council. Mr. Wilken stated that it was, adding that they were working on a master plan with the school which was not part of the original plan.

Mr. Engel asked if the handicapped ramp had a wall on one side and Mr. Wilken stated that the ramp had walls on both sides and gave a detailed description of the ramp.

Mr. Engel asked if the third classroom had access to restrooms and Mr. Wilken stated that there was a direct connection from the third classroom to the classroom where the restroom was located.

Mr. Aucamp asked if there was a landscape plan for this building. Mr. McClure stated there was minor landscaping around the new building, which was identified on the site plan, adding that only minor landscaping was necessary as the location was already heavily landscaped.

Chair Evans asked what the existing buildings looked like. Mr. Wilken explained that the buildings were residential properties, and the floor plans were modified to open classrooms in keeping with the Montessori philosophy. He stated that a 24 foot single car driveway was added, a required parking lot was added with additional parking spaces, and other improvements were also made. Mr. Wilken clarified that the purpose of this petition was to add a 3,000 square foot building.

Chair Evans if the building was a modular building. Mr. Wilken explained that it was a concrete block building. He added that they were trying to maintain the simple styling of the existing buildings.

Chair Evans asked what the structure on the roof was and Mr. Wilken explained that it was a cupola which was the required "outside air" for the air conditioning system, and was being used in place of a louver.

## **SITE PLAN COMMITTEE**

### **APRIL 10, 2001**

Ms. Dempsey explained that the trailer was existing at the site and would remain as a caretaker's residence. Chair Evans asked if it was a permanent structure and Ms. Dempsey explained that she believed it was initially approved as long as it remained a caretaker's residence and had nothing to do with the school. Mr. Engel stated that usually that condition was limited to one year, but Ms. Dempsey did not recall.

Chair Evans was concerned with the simple architecture of the building, stating that it was a "box with a cupola on top," adding that it lacked character. After closer review of the site plan and the other buildings, Chair Evans suggested making the cupola an aesthetic element rather than just a functional element. Chair Evans was also concerned with the lack of landscaping around the base of the building. Mr. Wilken explained that the berm was left grassy to allow for staging. Chair Evans asked if the lack of landscaping was due to sprinkler requirements and Ms. Dempsey agreed. Mr. Aucamp stated there was sufficient landscaping throughout the property; however, he added that the landscaping around the building should match the existing landscaping on the property. Chair Evans felt that the plan for the new building did not match the architecture of the existing building. He added that the only matching elements were the sloped shingle roof and the stucco. Mr. Wilken stated that it was actually closer to the existing buildings when seen in context. Chair Evans recommended expanding the cupola and trusses. Mr. Wilken stated that was the original idea. Mr. Engel agreed with Chair Evans regarding the trusses. Chair Evans stated that the cupola should be half the length of the building.

Vice-Mayor Paul recommended adding landscaping which did not need irrigation. Mr. Aucamp stated that this was already indicated. Mr. McClure added that according to the site plan, all new landscaped areas would be irrigated. Parking lot lighting was briefly discussed.

Vice-Mayor Paul made a motion, seconded by Mr. Engel, to approve based on the condition of accepting comments on the addition of the roof element to be an expanded cupola 40 feet long. In a roll call vote, the vote was as follows: Chair Evans - yes; Vice-Chair Marcellino - absent; Mr. Aucamp - yes; Mr. Engel - yes; Vice Mayor Paul - yes. **(Motion carried 4-0)**

## **5. OLD BUSINESS**

Mr. Aucamp wanted to know the exact role of the Committee. Mr. McClure stated that the role of the Committee was to review aesthetics, including landscape, building, and overall site plan.

Mr. Aucamp stated that petitions should not be brought before this Committee unless they were ready for approval. He added that if there was a list of comments from the Engineering Department and other departments, they should not be brought before this Committee because they were not ready for approval. Mr. McClure stated that the scheduling process between the Development Review Committee and the Site Plan Committee was taken out to eliminate conditional comments. He added that the Engineering Department would

almost always have conditional comments because the reviews were not ready for applicants in time for them to go before both Committees. Mr. McClure explained that the Engineering Department would then consider if the Site Plan Committee made alterations to a site plan which would affect the layout of the plan before final approval. He then explained that site plans were basically conceptual plans and it was not feasible to have all details included at this level because certain aspects were considered at the permit stage, including drainage calculations.

## **SITE PLAN COMMITTEE**

### **APRIL 10, 2001**

Chair Evans stated that Vice-Mayor Paul was a member of this Committee and drainage calculations were one of her major concerns. He added that Vice-Mayor Paul would not only introduce this concern at the site plan level, but also at Council level. Mr. McClure stated that the Engineering Department strongly approved of this; however, at this stage only preliminary engineering was required with a site plan. He reiterated that when the plan was reviewed for permit, it was looked at more closely and would not be approved unless it met the standards set by Code.

Chair Evans felt that at the site plan level, most calculations were completed so that the petitioner would know their project was feasible. Mr. Aucamp felt that discussion regarding drainage should not come before the Site Plan Committee because the Committee was not qualified and/or authorized to make decisions regarding this issue. He felt that it should be settled beforehand.

Also, Mr. Aucamp was concerned with site plans coming before this Committee without proper signatures and seals. Mr. McClure agreed that signatures and seals should be included at this level. Mr. McClure stated that by State Statute, the word architecture could not appear on the plan unless there was a registered architect. Chair Evans agreed with Mr. Aucamp's comments regarding this issue.

Mr. Aucamp again asked for clarification of the duties of the Committee, asking if drainage issues should be discussed. Mr. McClure stated that drainage should not be discussed at this level. He stated that Engineering did not want the Committee or the Council discussing drainage issues. Chair Evans again stated that if it was a concern of Vice-Mayor Paul, then she would discuss it, especially if there were comments and/or conditions in the report referring to drainage. There was further discussion regarding all conditions in site plan reports and it was clarified that the conditions were addressed at the permit level.

Mr. Aucamp was concerned that the Committee was becoming a policing agent. Chair Evans asked that Mr. McClure report to staff that the Committee "did not want comments unless the comments were done." Mr. McClure stated that the lack of a seal and appropriate signatures on Tail End Pet Resort's site plan was an error on the part of staff; however, he stated that there would almost always be minor conditions because the goal was to keep the plans moving forward. Chair Evans felt that drainage was not a minor condition.

Mr. Aucamp recommended that the Committee review the conditions and if they felt the conditions were not within their scope of authority, the plans should be sent back to the appropriate department for further investigation, and discussion should not take place at the Site Plan Committee level until a future date. Mr. Aucamp felt that if this was not done, the Site Plan Committees would become the "bad guys."

Mr. McClure stated that the Engineering Department did not do their calculations until permit time. Chair Evans felt that these calculations should be done beforehand because they

could alter the intentions of the Committee's approvals. He added that the Engineering Department should "have the responsibility to meet deadlines." Mr. McClure explained that there was one engineer for 77,000 people in the Town. Chair Evans recommended hiring additional engineers to alleviate the burden.

Mr. Aucamp stated that this issue needed to be further discussed. He asked how it could be resolved and Mr. McClure recommended that Vice-Mayor Paul bring it up at a Council meeting.

**SITE PLAN COMMITTEE**  
**APRIL 10, 2001**

Mr. Engel agreed with Chair Evans' comment that changes made by the Engineering Department could alter the intentions of the Committee's approvals.

**6. NEW BUSINESS**

There was no new business discussed.

**7. COMMENTS AND/OR SUGGESTIONS**

There were no comments and/or suggestions made.

**8. ADJOURNMENT**

There being no objections, the meeting was adjourned at 5:45 p.m.

Date Approved: \_\_\_\_\_

\_\_\_\_\_  
Chair/Committee Member